



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/186,584 11/05/98 GREENFIELD

J EN998073

EXAMINER

TM02/0713

KEVIN P RADIGAN  
HESLIN AND ROTHENBERG  
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE  
ALBANY NY 12203-5160

LEE, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED:

07/13/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/186,584**

Applicant(s)  
**Greenfield et al**

Examiner  
**Richard Lee**

Art Unit  
**2613**



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 26, 2001

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on Apr 26, 2001 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2613

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1-6 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greenfield et al of record (5,760,836).

Greenfield et al discloses a FIFO feedback and control for digital video encoder as shown in Figures 1 and 5, and the same method and encoder for encoding a digital video image stream in the encoder (see Figure 1), comprising means (21 of Figure 1) for spatial compression of still images in the digital video image stream and means (41 of Figure 1) for temporal compression between the still images, wherein the means for spatial compression comprises means for converting a time domain image of a macroblock to a frequency domain image of the macroblock (see column 1, lines 55-63), means for taking a discrete cosine transform of the frequency domain image (see column 1, lines 55-63), means for transforming the discrete cosine transformed macroblock image by a quantization factor (see 23 of Figure 1), and means for run length encoding the quantized discrete cosine transformed macroblock image (see 25 of Figure 1), wherein the means for temporal compression comprises means for reconstructing the quantized, discrete cosine transformed image of the macroblock (see Figure 1), means for searching for a best match macroblock, and means for constructing a motion vector therebetween (see column 6,

Art Unit: 2613

line 55 to column 7, line 11), the encoder for encoding thereby forming a bitstream comprising run length encoded, quantized, discrete cosine transformed macroblocks and motion vectors and passing the bitstream to and through an external buffer to a transmission medium (see column 6, line 55 to column 7, line 11), comprising means for feeding back to the encoder an external read signal from a host (see 51 and FIFO\_RD of Figure 5, and columns 5-7), and logic in the encoder for incrementing an on-chip counter each time that the external buffer is read and calculating therefrom the number of bits read by a host (see column 5, lines 31-50), the logic in the encoder being further adapted to monitor a number of bits encoded and written into the external buffer and subtract from the number of bits encoded the number of bits read by the host to obtain the fullness of an external buffer (see column 5, lines 53-59), and wherein the logic in the encoder is further adapted to provide the host with a dynamic buffer level indicator in real time indicative of the fullness of the external buffer (see columns 5-7); wherein the logic adapted to provide the host with a dynamic buffer level indicator comprises logic adapted to compare the fullness of the external buffer with a buffer threshold defined by the host and to provide a high level indicator when the buffer fullness is greater than the buffer threshold and a low level indicator when the buffer threshold is greater than the buffer fullness (see column 6, lines 18-29); further comprising a buffer threshold register (153 of Figure 5) within the encoder coupled to the logic adapted to compare the buffer fullness to the buffer threshold, wherein the external buffer comprises at least one FIFO buffer (see column 1, column 6, lines 18-45, and Figure 5); an external buffer configuration register (151 of Figure 5) in the encoder for retaining multiple external buffer

Art Unit: 2613

configuration values, and wherein the calculating in the encoder the number of bits read by the host includes employing a predefined configuration value of the external buffer configuration register in determining the number of bits read by the host upon receipt of each buffer read signal from the host, and wherein the multiple external buffer configuration values retained in the external buffer configuration register comprise at least some of 1, 2, 4, and 8 byte buffer configuration values, each value being representative of a number of bytes read from the external buffer with each buffer read signal from the host for a respective external buffer configuration (see column 5, lines 31-50).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-15 and 20-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenfield et al as applied to claims 1-6 and 16-19 in the above paragraph (5), and further in view of Choe et al (6,094,696).

Greenfield et al discloses substantially the same method and encoder for encoding a digital video image stream in the encoder as above, further including wherein the external buffer comprises one of a field buffer or cascaded FIFO buffers (see Figure 5), continuously comparing the fullness of the external buffer to a predefined buffer size and providing the host with a high level indicator when the buffer fullness is greater than or equal to the buffer size and a low level

Art Unit: 2613

indicator when the buffer size is greater the buffer fullness, and providing an on chip buffer size register for holding a host defined buffer size value for use in the comparing of the buffer fullness to the buffer size (see columns 5-6).

Greenfield et al does not particularly disclose, though, providing from the encoder to the host in real time a dynamically updated flag comprising at least one of a buffer empty flag, a buffer almost full flag and a buffer full flag as claimed in claims 7-11, 13, 20-22, 24, 27, and 29-31. However, Choe et al discloses a virtual serial data transfer mechanism and teaches the conventional use of a buffer management system wherein buffer full and buffer empty flags are set (see column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the Greenfield et al and Choe et al references in front of him/her and the general knowledge of flag indicating statuses for a buffer management system, would have had no difficulty in providing the buffer flagging system as taught by Choe et al as part of the buffer management within Figure 5 of Greenfield et al for the same well known flag identification purposes as claimed.

5. Regarding the applicants' arguments at pages 15-19 from the amendment filed April 26, 2001 concerning in general that "... Applicants respectfully submit that a careful reading of Greenfield et al fails to uncover any teaching, suggestion or implication that the processing or logic described therein comprises a dynamic buffer level indicator that is provided in real time as recited by applicants herein. In fact, Greenfield et al specifically describes a non-real time buffer level indicator. In Greenfield et al the buffer level indicator is provided dependent upon how

Art Unit: 2613

often the processor updates the indicator. The hardware described in Greenfield would be incapable of supporting any real time application. Column 6, lines 18-29 specifically state that the microcode reads the register and compares it with the buffer fullness in bytes (BF/8). This means that the processor is doing the updating of the buffer level indicator and that the buffer level signal is not returned on a real time basis ... Without a real time view of the fullness of the buffer, the host processor must wait until the microcode goes in, polls the on-chip register and calculates the fullness of the FIFO ...”, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Greenfield et al at column 1, lines 37-49 and column 5, lines 24-30 teaches the particular encoder processings and monitorings of external FIFO buffers in real time for transmission through a medium. Since these processings and monitorings of the external buffers are provided in real time as taught by Greenfield, applicants’ arguments that the particular microcode readings and comparisons with the buffer fullness as argued are not convincing. Contrary to the applicants’ statements, there is nothing in Greenfield et al that indicates the buffer level indicator being provided in non-real time. As such, it is submitted that Greenfield et al shows the same providing from the encoder to the host a dynamic buffer level indicator (i.e., provided by the external FIFO buffer, see column 5, lines 24-30, column 6) in real time indicative of the fullness of the external buffer.

Regarding the applicants’ arguments at pages 19-20 from the amendment filed April 26, 2001 concerning that “... Noticeably absent from the Office Action is any express teaching, suggestion or incentive identified in the art for making the proposed combination ... wherein the Court overturned a Board finding of obviousness, hindsight is always perfect and it is insufficient

Art Unit: 2613

to prove at the time of the claimed invention, the separate elements of the device were present in the known art ...", the Examiner wants to point out that:

"It should be too well settled now to require citation or discussion that the test for combining references is not what the individual references themselves suggest but rather what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. Any judgement on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning, but so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made and does not include knowledge gleaned only from applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper". In re McLanughlin, 170 USPQ 209-213.

Therefore, even though neither Greenfield et al nor Choe et al taken singularly suggests the combination as claimed, the combination of Greenfield et al and Choe et al taken as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding the applicants' arguments at pages 21-23 from the amendment filed April 26, 2001 concerning that "... Here, the results of this combination are drawn from Applicants' disclosure, in violation of this principle ... Neither Greenfield et al nor Choe et al provide from an encoder to a host a dynamically updated flag in real time. In fact, applicants not that Choe et al does not even involve an encoding process ... The flags of Choe et al are used to start data transfer operations. In contrast, the flags recited by applicants do not necessarily initiate data transfer ...", the Examiner wants to point out that the combination rejection has not been drawn from applicants' disclosure as argued, but instead based on the specific teachings of the combination of Greenfield et al and Choe et al (see above paragraph (4)). In addition, Choe et al describes many applications for the buffer management circuit which includes real time



Art Unit: 2613

processings of multimedia having video and audio components, video capture and playback, etc. (see column 1, lines 18-40), and it is considered obvious that encoded video data may be provided as part of the multimedia application. The applicants are reminded that: One of ordinary skill in the art is presumed to possess a certain amount of background knowledge independent of the references. In re Sovish, 769 F.2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Jacoby, 309 F.2d 513, 135 USPQ 317 (C.C.P.A. 1962). The conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference. In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (C.C.P.A. 1969). As such, it is submitted again that the buffer flagging system as taught by Choe et al may certainly be provided as part of the buffer management within Figure 5 of Greenfield et al for the same well known flag identification purposes as claimed.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2613

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**7. Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE")

**Or:**

(703) 308-6306 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2613

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308-6612.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

  
RICHARD LEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Richard Lee/rl

7/10/01

